A COMPARISON OF
DISADVANTAGED AND NONDISADVANTAGED ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PUPILS
ON TWO MEASURES OF SELF CONCEPT AS LEARNER

BY

ERNEST H. OWEN, JR.

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE COUNCIL OF
THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
1972

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A number of people have contributed to the execution of this research. Most important to its completion were the time and effort given by the students and teachers from whom the data were obtained. Their contributions and cooperation are deeply appreciated.

A special thanks goes to Dr. William W. Purkey who served as committee chairman and who was instrumental in the formulation of the research problem. His constant encouragement and helpful criticism were invaluable throughout this endeavor. His enthusiasm and concern for children's self perceptions have had a profound influence on the author's thinking.

The author is grateful to the members of his committee for their thoughtful guidance throughout his doctoral program. He is indebted to Dr. Vynce A. Hines for his assistance with research techniques and statistical analyses. His warmth and positive support are especially appreciated. The author is also indebted to Dr. Hannelore L. Wass for her suggestions and interest and to Dr. Franz R. Epting for his advice and cooperation. Their understanding and concern were helpful.

The author wishes to thank Mr. Earl Bleking for his valuable assistance in computer programming, Dr. Walter B.

Waetjen for his permission to use the SCAL, and Dr. Bob N. Cage for his helpful suggestions.

The love and understanding of the author's wife, Judy, and daughter, Jill, have been an inspiration without which this project could not have been completed. Judy also graciously typed the preliminary and final drafts.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.................................. ii

LIST OF TABLES.................................... vi

ABSTRACT..viii

CHAPTER

I. INTRODUCTION.................................. 1

Statement of the Problem.................. 3
Significance of the Study................. 4

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE......................... 7

Introduction.............................. 7
Self Concept and School Achievement....... 10
Self Concept of the Disadvantaged Pupil... 11
Defining Self Concept..................... 21
Measurement of Self Concept............... 24

III. DESIGN OF THE STUDY......................... 30

Hypotheses................................ 30
Procedures................................ 33
  Subjects................................ 33
  Instruments............................. 35
  Method.................................. 37
  Statistical Analyses.................... 38

IV. RESULTS...................................... 39

Comparisons Between Disadvantaged and Nondisadvantaged...................... 40
Comparisons Between Blacks and Whites..... 43
Comparisons of Blacks and Whites Within Disadvantagement Groups............... 48
Relationship Between the Florida Key and the SCAL.......................... 51

V. SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND CONCLUSIONS.......... 73

Summary of Results........................ 76

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont'd)

Page

Discussion.............................. 78
Conclusions............................. 82

APPENDICES.................................... 85

A. FLORIDA KEY............................ 87

B. SELF CONCEPT AS A LEARNER SCALE............... 89

BIBLIOGRAPHY.................................. 92

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH........................... 100

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE Page

1. Means and Standard Deviations of Disadvantaged and Nondisadvantaged on the _Florida Key_.................................... 41

2. Summary of F-Ratios for Comparisons of Disadvantaged and Nondisadvantaged, Blacks and Whites, and Blacks and Whites Within Levels on the _Florida Key_.............................. 42

3. Means and Standard Deviations of Disadvantaged and Nondisadvantaged on the _SCAL_........ 44

4. Summary of F-Ratios for Comparisons of Disadvantaged and Nondisadvantaged, Blacks and Whites, and Blacks and Whites Within Levels on the _SCAL_.................................. 45

5. Means and Standard Deviations of Blacks and Whites on the _Florida Key_..................... 46

6. Means and Standard Deviations of Blacks and Whites on the _SCAL_............................ 47

7. Means and Standard Deviations of Disadvantaged Blacks and Disadvantaged Whites on the _Florida Key_............................. 49

8. Means and Standard Deviations of Disadvantaged Blacks and Disadvantaged Whites on the _SCAL_.................................... 50

9. Means and Standard Deviations of Nondisadvantaged Blacks and Nondisadvantaged Whites on the _Florida Key_..................... 52

10. Means and Standard Deviations of Nondisadvantaged Blacks and Nondisadvantaged Whites on the _SCAL_............................ 53

11. Correlation Matrix of _Florida Key_ and _SCAL_ Scores..................................... 55

LIST OF TABLES (Cont'd)

TABLE Page

12. Means and Standard Deviations for Fifth and Sixth Grade Students on the Florida Key and SCAL 56

13. Correlation Matrix of Florida Key and SCAL Factors 57

14. Canonical Correlations of the Florida Key and the SCAL Factors 58

15. α and β Weights for the Significant Canonical R 58

16. Rotated Factor Loadings for Florida Key and SCAL Items When Pooled Together--Four Factors Rotated 60

17. Rotated Factor Loadings for Florida Key and SCAL Items When Pooled Together--Five Factors Rotated 63

18. Rotated Factor Loadings for Florida Key and SCAL Items When Pooled Together--Six Factors Rotated 66

19. Rotated Factor Loadings for Florida Key and SCAL Items When Pooled Together--Seven Factors Rotated 69

Abstract of Dissertation Presented to the
Graduate Council of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education

A COMPARISON OF DISADVANTAGED AND NONDISADVANTAGED ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PUPILS ON TWO MEASURES OF SELF CONCEPT AS LEARNER

By

Ernest H. Owen, Jr.

August, 1972

Chairman: Dr. William W. Purkey, Sr.
Major Department: Foundations of Education

The primary purpose of this study was to compare the self concepts as learner of disadvantaged elementary students with those of nondisadvantaged elementary students. Two related purposes were to explore the question of differences, if any, between Black and White students in regard to self concept as learner and to compare the *Florida Key* with the *Self Concept As A Learner*--*SCAL*.

Homeroom teachers of students in grades one through six in an elementary school in North Central Florida rated their students on the *Florida Key* to infer self concept as learner. Students in grades five and six of the same school were administered the *SCAL* to obtain professed self concept as learner scores.

For detecting the differences of self concept as learner between disadvantaged and nondisadvantaged students and between Blacks and Whites, multiple linear regression analyses were conducted. To answer the question of the relationship between the two self concept as learner instruments, all items of both instruments were pooled together and factor analyzed. A canonical correlation analysis and correlational matrix of the scores of the factors previously reported for these instruments were also used for determining the relationship of the two instruments.

The results of this study are summarized as follows: (1) Disadvantaged students scored significantly lower on all four factors of the Florida Key than nondisadvantaged students. (2) Disadvantaged students scored significantly lower on three of the four factors of the SCAL than did nondisadvantaged students. The factor on which no significant differences were found was problem solving. (3) Black students' scores on the Florida Key were significantly lower on all four factors than those of White students. (4) Black students' scores were significantly lower on three of the four SCAL factors than those of White students. The factor on which no significant differences were found was problem solving. (5) Disadvantaged Blacks' scores when compared to disadvantaged Whites' scores were significantly lower on only the relating factor of the Florida Key. (6) Disadvantaged Blacks when compared to disadvantaged Whites scored significantly lower on only the class member factor of the SCAL. (7) Nondisadvantaged Blacks scored significantly lower than nondisadvantaged Whites on only the asserting factor of the Florida Key. (8) No sig-

nificant differences were found between nondisadvantaged Blacks and nondisadvantaged Whites on the SCAL. (9) When comparing the Florida Key with the SCAL, several significant correlations were found although the commonality represented by these correlations was small. The pooled factor analysis resulted in the items of the two instruments being located in separate factors.

There were three main conclusions stemming from the results of this study. It was concluded that the disadvantaged student feels more negative about himself as a learner than the nondisadvantaged student. The second major conclusion of this study was that negative self concept as a learner is more closely related with the student's socioeconomic conditions than with his race. The third major conclusion was that the Florida Key and the SCAL measured some common aspects of the self concept as learner, although in terms of what they measured, the two instruments are more different than they are alike.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Recent research findings (Bledsoe, 1967; Campbell, 1967; Irwin, 1967; Gill, 1969) support the notion that a student's perception of himself may be a most important factor in his school achievement. Numerous studies indicate that underachievers hold more negative self concepts than do achievers (Goldberg, 1960; Shaw, 1961; Combs, 1963; Durr & Schmatz, 1964). High school dropouts have been shown to have significantly lower self concepts of ability than students who stay in school (Harding, 1966). The relationship between the self concept and achievement in school appears to be persistent and significant (LaBenne & Greene, 1969; Purkey, 1970). The strength of this relationship is such that the student's conception of himself as a learner has been deemed as important as, if not more important than, measured mental ability as a factor in school success (Brookover, Erickson, & Joiner, 1967; Purkey, 1970).

In attempting to enhance the school achievement of the disadvantaged child, psychologists and educators have conducted an increasing amount of research and writing on the self perceptions of the disadvantaged (Long & Henderson, 1968; Carpenter & Busse, 1969; Trowbridge, 1970). While academic achievement may be primarily associated with one dimension of the self, the self concept as learner; most of these studies on the disadvantaged have focused on more general and global, social self concepts. Since a major concern for studying the self conceptions of the disadvantaged is to find reasons for his poor achievement, it is the assumption of the present study that research will be more useful if it explores the self concept as learner rather than the broader, social context of self conceptions. Several writers have stressed the need for more limited, operational definitions in self concept research (Wylie, 1961; Coller, 1971). It is the nature of the present study to concentrate on the self concept as learner of disadvantaged students.

Another factor which is seen as a limitation of most of the research on self concept is the almost complete reliance on what an individual says about himself as an accurate measure of his self concept. While valuable information about a person's self conceptions may be obtained from self reports, Combs, Courson, and Soper (1963) have stressed the importance of using inferential techniques in measuring self concepts.

The present study employed two instruments: (1) a self report measure which elicits responses directly from the student regarding his self concept as a learner, and (2) a behavioral rating scale from which a student's self concept as learner is inferred. Both of these instruments are attempts to measure a more specifically defined dimension of the self, the self concept as learner.

Statement of the Problem

This study explored the self concept _as_ _learner_ of a group of disadvantaged elementary students. The disadvantaged students in this study came from homes identified as economically deprived in the ESEA Title I Survey to Determine Target Area Designation. The primary purpose of the study here reported was to compare self concepts as learner of disadvantaged students with those of nondisadvantaged students.

In addition to the primary purpose, there were two secondary purposes. One of these purposes was to determine differences, if any, between Black and White students in measures of self concept as learner. Differences between the self concepts of Blacks and Whites are often discussed interchangeably with differences between the self concepts of disadvantaged and nondisadvantaged students.

It was also a purpose of this study to compare the _Florida_ _Key_ (Purkey, Cage, & Graves, 1971), an inferred measure of self concept as learner, with the _Self_ _Concept_ _As_ _A_ _Learner_--_SCAL_ (Waetjen, 1967), a self report instrument. These instruments, although they employ different approaches, focus on self concept as learner. This study attempted to shed additional light on the relationship between observed and professed self concept as learner and to determine the extent to which these scales measured the same variables.

Significance of the Study

There is evidence that self concept is significantly related to school achievement (Lecky, 1945; Walsh, 1956; Purkey, 1970). It is also clear that the disadvantaged are not as successful in school as the nondisadvantaged (Deutsch, 1963; Coleman et al., 1966; Larson & Slocum, 1969). The question that follows seems to be: Is the disadvantaged child's poor school achievement related to negative self perceptions, particularly negative views of self as learner?

Many educators have stated that disadvantaged children have negative self conceptions (Ausubel & Ausubel, 1963; Passow, 1963; Kozol, 1967). Some recent research, however, indicates that on measures of general self concept, there is no significant difference between the self concepts of disadvantaged students and those of nondisadvantaged students (Rosenberg, 1965; Yeatts, 1967; Debiassie & Healy, 1970). There is even some evidence that on measures of global self concepts, disadvantaged children may have more positive self conceptions than nondisadvantaged children (Soares & Soares, 1969; Trowbridge, 1970).

In reviewing studies of the self concept of the disadvantaged, some writers have concluded that disadvantaged students obtain positive self concept scores on scales which attempt to measure more global, social self concepts, but seem to reflect more negative feelings on scales which tend to measure that part of the self which is mainly related to school (Miller & Woock, 1970; Zirkel, 1971).

Where most research on the disadvantaged attempts to measure more global self concepts, the present study focused on the self concept as learner. Purkey (1970) described the self as being composed of a number of concepts which a person holds true about himself. "...each concept in the system has its own generally negative or positive value" (p. 9). Coller (1971) suggested that much of the confusion in self concept research is due to the researchers' attempting to measure more general self conceptions rather than specific dimensions of the self such as self concept as learner.

Many writers have discussed the fact that self concept research suffers from the almost exclusive use of self report. Instruments depending on self report are considered to be easily influenced by such factors as: social expectancy, the cooperation of the subject, his freedom from threat, and the subject's response habits (Combs & Soper, 1957; Wylie, 1961). The influence of these factors is considered to be even more crucial in studies of disadvantaged children where cultural bias is likely. Nearly all the studies of the disadvantaged child's self perceptions, however, have used self report instruments.

In addition to the more traditional self report instrument, this study employed a behavioral rating scale which focused on specific behavioral acts determined as reflective of a student's self concept as learner. Such behavioral rating scales, due to their inferential nature, can be used to obtain self concept measures without the subject's knowledge or cooperation.

This chapter has presented the statement of the problem and the nature and significance of this study. The primary purpose of this study was to compare the self concept as learner of disadvantaged pupils with those of non-disadvantaged pupils. Secondary purposes of this study were to compare the self concepts as learner of Black students with those of White students and to compare two measures of self concept as learner.

Chapter Two is a presentation of literature related to the problem of this study. The design and hypotheses of the study are given in Chapter Three; the results are in Chapter Four; and the summary, discussion, and conclusions are in Chapter Five.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

Before the turn of the present century William James displayed a concern for the self as a psychological construct (1890). He saw the self as being composed of spiritual, material, and social aspects. The spiritual self was composed of mental faculties and inclinations, while material possessions comprised the material self. The social self was the person's concept of the esteem and regard others have for him. James saw the self as possessing the dynamic qualities of self-preservation and seeking.

Other early writers, including Dewey (1891), Titchener (1898), and Cooley (1902) believed that there was a need to include the self as a concept in psychological theory. Interest in self theory dwindled, however, during the 1920's and 1930's as many psychologists under the influence of J. B. Watson became interested in behaviorism which argued that consciousness was not fit for psychological study. It was during the 1930's, however, that George Mead (1934) did a large amount of writing on the self. Mead called himself a "social behaviorist" and emphasized social conditions as the determining factors in personality development.

A resurgence of writing on the self was seen during the 1940's and 1950's although little empirical work was done prior to 1949. Since that time self theory has continued to gain the attention of psychologists (Wylie, 1961). The beginning of renewed American interest in self seems to have occurred with the publication of Allport's (1937) book on personality (Sarbin, 1952).

In his review of the development of thinking about the self, Diggory (1966) pointed out that the new self psychologists were able to convince the heirs of behaviorists that there might be something to the idea of the self after all. Hilgard (1949) concluded that the notion of the self was implied by defense mechanisms and that it can be a unifying concept.

American psychologists working in clinical areas found behavioristic models too limited to account for most human behavior. Carl Rogers (1951) was one of the most prolific of the therapists who saw the self as the central aspect of personality. Similarly to Mead (1934) and Sullivan (1950), Rogers described the self as a social product. Sullivan felt that the self developed as a result of the organism's interaction with significant others. The person responds to himself with certain feelings and attitudes as others respond to him (Mead, 1934). These self feelings and attitudes then influence future behavior. Snygg and Combs (1949) stress that all behavior, without exception, is dependent upon the personal frame of reference of the individual. Their work has been a major force in renewing the concern for the self in psychology and education.

Most of those who have theorized about the self see human behavior as the result of the individual's striving to maintain and enhance the way in which he perceives himself (Rogers, 1951; Combs & Snygg, 1959). A person's behavior at any given moment is viewed as a reflection of the concept or view he holds of self (Combs & Snygg, 1959). It seems that when a student sees himself as a capable person he attempts to behave in ways that demonstrate capability (Purkey, 1970).

According to Combs, Avila, and Purkey (1971) the self is the focal point of the person's universe of experience and his reference point for evaluating and coping with his environment. As the self begins to develop, the individual strives to maintain it and to behave in ways consistent with it. Inadequate self concepts that have been formed are perpetuated as unhealthy influences on later development.

Unlike the periods prior to and immediately following the lull in concern for the self in psychology of the 1920's and 1930's, during the last twenty years there has been an increasing amount of empirical investigation of the self concept. In 1961 Wylie made a comprehensive review of the research which had been conducted on the self concept up until that time. Self theory research has focused on the investigation of the relationship between the self concept and variables such as school achievement (Purkey, 1970), psychological adjustment (Sarbin & Rosenberg, 1955), therapeutic change (Rogers & Dymond, 1954), delinquency (Fitts & Hamner, 1969), disadvantagement (Zirkel, 1971), and body type (Felker & Kay, 1971).

Self Concept and School Achievement

Research findings have consistently indicated that self concept is significantly related to school achievement. Self concept is seen as possibly being more powerful an influence on achievement than mental ability (Brookover, Erickson, & Joiner, 1967). Underachievers have consistently been identified as having negative self concepts (Walsh, 1956; Shaw, Edson, & Bell, 1960; Fink, 1962). Caplin (1966) studied the relationship between the self concept and school achievement of Black students and found results consistent with other research findings which indicate the importance of a healthy self concept for academic success.

Lecky (1945), Reeder (1955), Bledsoe (1967), and Campbell (1967) also reported significant relationships between the self concept and achievement in school. In summarizing his research, Irwin states, "...it may well be that a positive conception of one's self as a person is not only more important than striving to get ahead and enthusiasm for studying and going to school, but that it is a central factor when considering optimal scholastic performance" (1967, p. 271).

Gill's statement in regard to his study is also worth noting: "The results of this study support the conclusion with such convincing uniformity that the importance of the self concept in the educational process seems to need more emphasis than is presently given to it" (1969, p. 6).

In their 1965 report, Brookover, Patterson, and Thomas concluded that not only is the self concept of ability related to school achievement, but there are specific academic self concepts of ability which are related to specific academic areas and which differ from the self concept of general ability.

Empirical evidence seems clearly to indicate that the student's concept of himself as a learner is a vital factor in his educational success. The enhancement of the disadvantaged student's self concept as learner appears to be a vital step in improving his academic achievement.

Self Concept of the Disadvantaged Pupil

Due to the concern in education for learning more about the disadvantaged child so that his school experience might be made more productive, there has been an increasing amount of research and writing on the self concepts of disadvantaged students. Because of the apparent influence of environmental circumstances on the way a person sees himself, many educators have assumed that children from lower socioeconomic backgrounds--commonly referred to as disadvantaged--would have more negative self concepts than those children from higher socioeconomic backgrounds (Ausubel & Ausubel, 1963; Passow, 1963; Havighurst & Moorefield, 1967; Kozol, 1967; Tannenbaum, 1967). They conclude that the living conditions of disadvantaged children are harsh and self-degrading. These children are seen as being handicapped by their poverty and unstimulating living conditions. They are viewed as having low aspirations and being concerned with immediate self-gratification.

If disadvantaged students do come to school with negative self concepts, then to be helped to succeed in school, they must first be aided in developing a more positive self concept. The assumption that disadvantaged children have a more negative self concept than nondisadvantaged children, however, has not been supported consistently in research results. Research on the self concept of disadvantaged children is somewhat confusing. While some research results support the view that disadvantaged children have more negative self concepts (Long, 1968; Samuels, 1969; Cook, 1970), several researchers have found evidence which contradicts this assumption (Coopersmith, 1967; Soares & Soares, 1969; Powers et al., 1971).

The review of research on self perceptions of the disadvantaged pupil is divided into two parts. The first part reports on research findings having demonstrated negative self concepts for disadvantaged students. The second part of the review of research on the comparisons between disadvantaged and nondisadvantaged students reviews studies which show positive self conceptions for the disadvantaged.

Research Indicating Negative Self Concepts for the Disadvantaged

Several researchers have found results supporting the assumption that disadvantaged students hold more negative self conceptions than nondisadvantaged students.

In an early study, Goff (1954) obtained data from students' answers to questions which centered around successes or failures in competitive out-of-school activities; ranking of self in relation to in-school academic performance; ambitions, goals or aspiration levels, and major wishes held. The 120 children in Goff's study included sixty boys and sixty girls all from Durham, North Carolina. Six- to eight-year-old and twelve- to fourteen-year-old children were equally represented. She found that lower income children showed a marked feeling of inadequacy in relation to school subjects and a decrease in confidence level in out-of-school activities with an increase in age.

Cook (1970) studied 373 students from high schools in Maine. Comparisons were made between disadvantaged and nondisadvantaged students from rural depressed, rural nondepressed, affluent suburban, and typical urban communities. A subject was considered disadvantaged if the head of his household was unemployed or employed in an unskilled occupation. The Tennessee Self Concept Scale was used for obtaining measures of self concept. Factor analysis of variance revealed that disadvantaged students felt less adequate in school interaction than did nondisadvantaged students.

Egbert, Ballif, and Hendrix (1968) concluded from their study that preschool, lower class children have less well developed self concepts pertaining to body images than do middle class preschoolers. Twenty preschool children identified as in the poverty group by OEO standards were compared with twenty preschool children from middle class families as judged by father's occupation. Their conclusions were based on the subjects' demonstrated ability to recognize their own photographs from five other unidentified photographs on each of a series of six different views: front view, forty-five degrees right view, ninety degrees right view, forty-five degrees left view, ninety degrees left view, and back view.

Samuels (1969) measured the effects of social class on the self concepts of ninety-three suburban New York City kindergarten children. Using the picture-choice Clark U-Scale and the paired-adjective Brown Test, Samuels found that middle class children had significantly higher self concepts than lower class children although no racial differences were discovered.

A study by Long (1968) of entering first-graders compared ninety-six Black children with ninety-six White children. Socioeconomic class was determined by the occupation of the chief wage earner of the family. A preschool form of the Ziller Self-Social Symbols Method was used for obtaining self concept measures. This method consists of presenting the subject with a series of symbolic arrays in which circles or other figures represent the self and other persons. The subject then responds to each task by either drawing or pasting on a sheet of paper a symbol to represent the self. Black students were found to have lower self esteem than White students. It was concluded that social class seemed to be a determinant of self esteem in young children of both races.

Although in the following study the disadvantaged students were all Black, they were identified as disadvantaged because they met the low-income requirement for enrollment in a Head Start Program. A preschool form of the Children's Self-Social Constructs Test which measures self esteem, realism, and identification and a teacher rating scale of classroom behaviors were used by Long and Henderson (1968) with 144 school beginners in a rural Southern community. Disadvantaged children professed lower self esteem. Low self esteem was found also to be associated with immature classroom behavior.

Larson and Slocum (1969) analyzed the relationship between family income and professed physical, social, academic, and emotional self concepts of 610 rural students from thirty Washington high schools. Students from low income families were less likely to report positive scores on self-evaluation scales than students from higher income families.

Brown (1966) administered the Brown-Ids Self Concept Referents Test to three samples of four year olds in New York City. One sample included Black children who were from low socioeconomic families and were attending an enriched preschool program. Another sample was composed of low socioeconomic Black children enrolled in a day care center while the third sample consisted of children from White, upper-middle socioeconomic status families. The Brown-Ids Self Concept Referents Test consists of having the child respond to an orally defined, bipolar, alternate-choice scale in response to his own photograph. The child answers all of the questions on the scale four times each in regard to (1) how he sees himself, (2) how he sees his mother seeing him, (3) how he sees his teacher seeing him, (4) how he sees other children seeing him. It was discovered that the two groups of lower socioeconomic Black children obtained self concept scores significantly lower than the more advantaged White children.

Williams and Byars (1968) in their study focused on the self esteem of 310 adolescents in Georgia communities where desegregation of public facilities and schools was occurring. On the Tennessee Self Concept Scale on twelve of the seventeen self-evaluation dimensions, the Black subjects obtained scores significantly below the corresponding normative means. The findings indicated that the Black students were significantly lower than the White students on moral-ethical self, personal self, social self, self criticism (computed only for males), defensive positive scale, total conflict, personality integration, personality disorder, general maladjustment, and psychosis. There was no significant difference on physical self, family self, or total positive self. Williams and Byars did not take into consideration the socioeconomic level of their subjects.

Research Indicating Positive Self Concepts for the Disadvantaged

The research evidence cited above appears to confirm theoretically based statements that disadvantaged pupils, due to harsh environmental influences, possess negative self conceptions. The results of other studies, however, imply quite different conclusions. The following research studies did not find disadvantaged students to have negative self concepts. Some of these studies even found disadvantaged students to have more positively measured self concepts than nondisadvantaged students.

Rosenberg (1965), using the Guttman Scale in a study of 5024 high school juniors and seniors, found a weak relationship of social class to self esteem and found no relationship of ethnic affiliation to self esteem. The Guttman Scale has ten items to which subjects respond on a four-point scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Rosenberg states: "...there is no indication that the distribution of self-acceptance in a group is related to the social prestige of that group in American society...Negroes, who are exposed to the most intense, humiliating, and crippling forms of discrimination in virtually every institutional area, do not have particularly low self esteem" (pp. 56-57).

Coopersmith (1967) also obtained a weak relationship between social class and self esteem on the Coopersmith Self Esteem Inventory when comparing eighty-five preadolescents from the Central Connecticut Public schools. He concluded: "It appears that the broader social context does not play as important a role in interpreting one's own successes as has often been assumed" (p. 35). "Poverty and overpopulation may have deleterious consequences upon other personality traits, but insofar as they are measured by our instruments and sample, they have little, if any, effect upon self esteem" (p. 151).

A study in which the Tennessee Self Concept Scale was used was one by Debiassie and Healy (1970). They compared the scores of Spanish-American, Black and Anglo adolescents in regard to both ethnic groups and socioeconomic status groups. The subjects were 607 ninth-grade students in a school district in South Central New Mexico. Of the fourteen indices on the Tennessee Self Concept Scale, four scores showed differences among ethnic groups. Total self concept scores were not significantly different among ethnic groups nor students of different socioeconomic status.

In her analysis of developmental changes in the self report of 8,979 North Central Florida children in grades three through twelve, Yeatts (1967) found that professed self concept varied with sex and grade level but not with race or socioeconomic status. The self report instrument used in this study was the How I See Myself Scale developed by Ira Gordon at the University of Florida.

Using the Coopersmith Self Esteem Inventory, Zirkel and Moses (1971) compared 120 fifth- and sixth-grade Blacks, Whites, and Puerto Ricans of a large Connecticut city. The groups were selected so as to be similarly distributed according to socioeconomic status. The results showed lower self concepts for Puerto Rican students. Black students had an apparently higher overall self concept than White students, but not statistically significant.

Coleman et al. (1966) used three items in comparing school-related self concepts of Blacks and Whites: (1) How bright do you think you are in comparison with the other students in your grade? (2) Agree or disagree: I would do better in school if teachers didn't go so fast. (3) Agree or disagree: I sometimes feel that I just can't learn. In general the students' responses did not indicate differences between Blacks and Whites.

In a study employing a semantic differential scale called Me in School, Hodgkins and Stakenas (1969) showed that significant differences between 242 Southern high school and college age Blacks and Whites existed in self-adjustment and self-assurance in the school situation with Blacks tending to score more positively than Whites. When level of social status was controlled within race, however, the differences were not maintained, although the tendency still existed.

Trowbridge (1970) found in her study of sixty-four elementary classrooms in Iowa, that children in low socioeconomic areas consistently held a significantly higher self concept than did children of advantaged areas. A more global self report instrument, the Coopersmith Self Esteem Inventory, was used in this study.

Soares and Soares (1969) used five self perception scales (self reports) in their studies of the self perceptions of disadvantaged children in grades four through eight. On all five scales, the disadvantaged children had consistently higher means than the advantaged children, with significance resulting on four of the five measures: self concept, ideal concept, reflected self--teacher, and reflected self--parents. The reflected self--classmates was the self perception having no significant results.

Powers and others (1971) indicated that in a sample of 199 tenth-grade students in an inter-suburban high school, Black students were not significantly lower on any of the five scales of the Soares and Soares Inventory, and in fact were significantly higher than non-Jewish-Whites in self image.

Because of the apparent importance of positive self perceptions for children and due to the inconclusive evidence in regard to the self concept and its relationship to disadvantagement, there is a need for more definitive research. Several researchers have also indicated a need to further dimensionalize research in this area (Soares & Soares, 1969; Zirkel, 1971).

Defining Self Concept

The contradictions in research results on the self concept of the disadvantaged may be due to difficulties inherent in most all areas of research on the self concept. Research in self concept theory has been plagued with a variety of definitions of self concept and an equally varied number of measuring devices (Coller, 1971). In examining the empirical literature pertaining to self concept, Wylie found a "...bewildering array of hypotheses, measuring instruments and research designs has been used" (1961, p. 3). Zirkel, in his review of self concept of the disadvantaged, counted fifteen definitions of self concept explicitly cited among the studies reviewed with several other definitions implicit in the various instruments and designs of the studies (1971).

In surveying the numerous definitions of "self" used by self theorists, Coller concluded, "Most contemporary theorists define 'self' either as a group of psychological processes that govern behavior and adjustment, and/or as an organized collection of attitudes, beliefs, and feelings a person has about himself" (1971, p. 1). The first of these two definitions is the "self as doer," a determiner of behavior, while the second definition is the "self as object," how an individual sees himself.

Combs and Snygg employ both of these definitions in their theory. They see the self as "...product of the individual's experience and producer of whatever new experience he is capable of" (1959, p. 146). "Self is composed of perceptions concerning the individual and this organization of perceptions in turn has vital and important effects upon the behavior of the individual" (Combs, in Hall & Lindzey, 1970, p. 518).

Similarly LaBenne and Greene (1969) in their review of self theories state that while "...each of these theorists introduced his preferred jargon, all used the term 'self' to have one of these three meanings: (1) a dynamic process; (2) a system of awareness; or (3) an interrelated process and awareness" (p. 2).

Many other theorists have also viewed the self as both object of awareness and a dynamic process. Lewin (1936), Allport (1937), Bertocci (1945), and Cattell (1950) attributed a dual role to the self.

Research on the relationship of the self and school achievement supports the view that the self is both a product and producer of experience. In discussing this research, Purkey states: "The best evidence now available suggests that it is a two-way street, that there is a continuous interaction between self and academic achievement, and that each directly influences the other" (1970, p. 23).

This dual role of the self is the reason why self conceptions are so important as an area of psychological investigation. At the same time it is this dynamic quality that creates much difficulty for the self researchers. Inadequate and distorted aspects of the self concept may cause the subject to behave defensively when trying to reveal his self conceptions, resulting in inaccurate measurements of his self.

Several writers have stressed the importance of seeing the self concept as a multidimensional construct. Purkey defines the self as: "...a complex and dynamic system of beliefs which an individual holds true about himself, each belief with a corresponding value. These beliefs may be divided into categories (student, Negro, husband, American, tennis player, Christian) and attributes (strong, tall, ugly, young, friendly)" (1970, pp. 7, 9). Coller states: "Self concept is not a unitary concept, and thus it is inappropriate to treat a person as if he held only one self concept... we speak of the self concept of a person in respect to either a set of attributes (e.g., dominance, height, etc.) or roles (e.g., father, psychologist, student, etc.)" (1971, p. 18). Brookover and Erickson (1969) also suggested that the self is composed of organized sets of attributes and roles. Other researchers have stressed the multidimensional view of the self (Alberti, 1970; Stanwyck & Felker, 1971).

Caplin (1968) in his comparison of children in integrated and segregated settings found a significant difference in school-related self concept although the difference was not apparent in regard to a more global, social context of self. In commenting on the disadvantaged child's more positive scores in some research, Miller and Woock (1970) concluded that disadvantaged students may do reasonably well on measures of a "general self concept," but not on measures of "...self concept of achievement, that is, self measured against the standards and expectations of the school as a middle-class institution" (1970, p. 171).

It seems that this school-related self or self concept as a learner is the most influential on school achievement. A student may see himself very positively as an athlete or street fighter, but in the school setting he is expected to adopt a more passive role. For the disadvantaged child this role is often alien to what he has previously learned to value. This conflict of values most often causes negative self conceptions in relation to the learner role and results in subsequent poor achievement.

Measurement of Self Concept

The self, being composed of the thoughts, feelings, and beliefs of a person, does not lend itself to direct observation. Measurements a self researcher makes of another individual's self conceptions must be obtained either by the subject's own report of his self conceptions or by inferences made from observations of his behavior.

When using the self report method, the individual is usually given a list of statements or adjectives in the form of questions as to how he sees himself. The self report often serves as a quick and economical means for assessing self conceptions. Several theorists have supported the use of self report instruments (Rogers, 1951; Allport, 1955; Sarbin & Rosenberg, 1955). Strong and Feder state: "Every evaluative statement that a person makes concerning himself can be considered a sample of his self concept, from which inferences may then be made about the various properties of that self concept" (1961, p. 170).

Other theorists have criticized the self report method (Combs, Courson, & Soper, 1963; Heilbrun, 1965; Purinton, 1965; Shulman, 1968). Combs, Courson, and Soper question the use of self report instruments for measuring self concept. They argue that what a person is willing and able to disclose to someone is rarely, if ever, identical to what that individual actually believes about himself. Combs and Soper (1957) state that the degree to which the self report can be relied upon as an accurate indication of the self concept depends upon such factors as: (1) the clarity of the subject's awareness; (2) his command of adequate symbols for expression; (3) social expectancy; (4) the cooperation of the subject; and (5) his freedom from threat.

Wylie (1961) says that self report responses may be influenced by such things as: "(a) subject's intent to select what he wishes to reveal to the examiner, (b) subject's intent to say that he has attitudes or perceptions which he doesn't have, (c) subject's response habits, particularly those involving introspection and the use of language, and (d) host of situational and methodological factors which may not only induce variations of (a), (b), and (c) but may exert other more superficial influences on the responses obtained" (p. 24).

Some questions have been raised about the self reports of disadvantaged children by various investigators. Greenberg (1970) suggests that high ratings of disadvantaged children might stem from their greater defensive needs. Long (1969) raises the question of a response set for extremity among the disadvantaged children.

Various researchers have attempted to devise ways of getting around the problems involved in measuring self perceptions. Combs and Soper (1963) stress the advantages of using an inferential technique called "self as instrument" method. This method employs psychologists, who are trained in perceptual theory, to rate the subject on a rating scale. The trained observers make their ratings on the basis of their observation of the subject's behavior, interviews, and/or projective techniques. While this method overcomes the limitations of the self report procedure, the necessity of having trained observers makes it a much more time consuming and costly procedure (Coller, 1971).

In order to avoid the problems inherent in self reports and at the same time to construct a less costly and time consuming procedure than the "self as instrument," some researchers have devised rating scales which do not require trained observers (McDaniel, 1967; DiLorenzo, 1969; Purkey, Cage, & Graves, 1971). These observational techniques involve a rating of the student by his teacher in regard to certain attributes, self perceptions, or behaviors. The score on the rating scale is an inference of the student's self concept.

Many self researchers rely on only one method of measuring the self concept: either self report or observation. A combination of these procedures, however, seems advantageous (Coller, 1971). Fiske states that not until the investigator "...can demonstrate comparable findings from different ways of measuring his variable can he begin to hope that he is getting at the core of his concept and is not misinterpreting systematic method variance as trait variance" (1963, p. 464).

The two instruments used in this study were developed to measure self concept as learner. One instrument, the Florida Key, is an observational behavior rating scale. The other is a self report instrument, the Self Concept As A Learner--SCAL.

The Florida Key was developed to overcome some of the apparent weaknesses of the self report method. It does not require that the subject have any awareness of the fact that he is being measured. The Florida Key is quickly and easily scored by the subject's classroom teacher. The teacher rates the student as to the frequency with which he engages in eighteen classroom behaviors. These ratings serve as an inference of the pupil's self concept as learner.

In a study of 355 elementary pupils from two schools in North Central Florida, a factor analysis showed the Florida Key to measure four areas of learner self concept; relating, asserting, investing, and coping (Purkey, Cage, & Graves, 1971).

In a study by Graves (1972), the Florida Key was compared with two self report measures: the Coopersmith Self Esteem Inventory and a self report version of the Florida Key called the Pupil Florida Key. Graves found little commonality between the parallel items on the Florida Key and the Pupil Florida Key. Similar results were also found when comparisons of the two instruments were made according to scores on the four factors previously established for the Florida Key. It was concluded from this study that self report measures should generally be considered as distinct from inferred measures. Another aspect of Graves' study was to compare students from two different elementary schools. He found that students from the more innovative of the two schools obtained higher self concept scores.

The Self Concept As A Learner--SCAL was developed in 1963 by Walter Waetjen at the University of Maryland. Some 440 self-referential statements were gleaned from many different self report instruments. The SCAL is composed of fifty items on each of which the subject is asked to rate himself. Four aspects of measured learner self concept were identified through a factor analysis: motivation, task orientation, problem solving, class member. The SCAL has been in popular use in various school systems throughout the country in fifth grade through high school. It has also been employed in a number of doctoral dissertations and other research projects (Waetjen, 1967).

Chapter Two included an overview of the historical developments in research and writings on the self. Research indicating the importance of a healthy self concept as learner for success in school was reviewed. The concern for the self concept of the disadvantaged and theoretical statements regarding the impact of disadvantagement on self perceptions were discussed. It was noted that research findings on the relationship between disadvantagement and self concept have been inconsistent. Empirical studies indicating negative self concepts for the disadvantaged were reviewed as were studies showing the disadvantaged to have positive self concepts. Two main problems of self concept research were discussed: defining self concept and measurement of self concept. The need for more limited theoretical constructs and the use of other measurement methods in addition to self reports in research on self conceptions was cited.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Chapter Three includes the hypotheses tested, the method used in collecting the data, a description of the subjects, the instruments used, and the statistical analyses employed. This study employed a comparative survey method to investigate the relationship between disadvantagement and self concept as learner. A group of disadvantaged elementary school pupils was compared with their nondisadvantaged schoolmates on two measures of self concept as learner. Comparisons were also made between Black pupils and White pupils on each of these two measures. In addition the relationship between two self concept as learner instruments was investigated.

Hypotheses

In some recent research disadvantaged students, when compared to more advantaged students, have obtained as positive scores, and in some cases more positive scores, on self report instruments measuring a more general self concept. It seems that disadvantaged students would obtain more negative scores, however, on instruments measuring a dimension of the self concept more closely related to school achievement. To test this proposition, the following two hypotheses were devised:

(1) There is a significant difference between disadvantaged and nondisadvantaged pupils on inferred self concept as learner as measured by the Florida Key.

(2) There is a significant difference between disadvantaged and nondisadvantaged pupils on professed self concept as learner as measured by the SCAL.

Hypotheses three and four concern the comparisons of Black and White pupils on two measures of self concept as learner. Some researchers' disadvantaged sample was composed of only Black students while their more advantaged sample included only White students. The samples for the present study included subjects of both races in each group. As in most populations, however, the disadvantaged students in this study were predominantly Black and the nondisadvantaged students were predominantly White. Because of this unequal racial distribution in disadvantagement groups, Black pupils were expected to obtain more negative self concepts as learner than White students. The following hypotheses were tested:

(3) There is a significant difference between Black and White pupils on inferred self concept as learner as measured by the Florida Key.

(4) There is a significant difference between Black and White pupils on professed self concept as learner as measured by the SCAL.

Most self concept theories consistently describe the self concept as a social product developing through interaction with the environment. It seems safe to conclude that negative self conceptions are more closely associated with the person's social and environmental circumstances (i.e., disadvantagement) rather than with his racial inheritance. The following four hypotheses were concerned with this question of whether significant differences exist between Blacks and Whites when both races are similar in terms of disadvantagement:

(5) There is a significant difference between disadvantaged Black and disadvantaged White pupils on inferred self concept as learner as measured by the Florida Key.

(6) There is a significant difference between disadvantaged Black and disadvantaged White pupils on professed self concept as learner as measured by the SCAL.

(7) There is a significant difference between nondisadvantaged Black and nondisadvantaged White pupils on inferred self concept as learner as measured by the Florida Key.

(8) There is a significant difference between nondisadvantaged Black and nondisadvantaged White pupils on professed self concept as learner as measured by the SCAL.

A secondary purpose of this study was to compare the two instruments employed in the study. While both instruments were developed to measure self concept as learner, they employ two diverse methods: one instrument is a self report; the other is a behavioral rating scale to infer self concept. Several investigators have obtained quite diverse results when comparing professed and inferred measures of self concept (Combs, Courson, & Soper, 1963; Graves, 1972). Hypothesis nine is concerned with the comparisons between two measures of self concept as learner:

> (9) Fifth and sixth grade students' scores on the Florida Key correlate significantly with their scores on the SCAL.

Procedures

Measures of the self concepts as learner of a group of elementary school pupils were obtained with a self report and an inferred instrument. The students were then compared according to disadvantagement and race. The two instruments were statistically tested for commonalities. Following are descriptions of the subjects, instruments, method, and statistical analyses used in this study.

Subjects

Students in grades one through six in an elementary school in North Central Florida were the subjects for this study. The school had been in operation since 1969 and was two years old when this study was conducted. Initially most of the school's students came from two neighboring elementary schools. One of these schools, located in a Black neighborhood, had a predominantly Black student population. The other school was located in a predominantly White neighborhood and primarily served White students. Both schools had outgrown their physical plants. In the school from which the subjects were obtained for this study, 222 of the students were Black and 372 were White. Thirty-eight per cent of the students had been identified as "economically deprived" (disadvantaged) according to standards of ESEA Title I Poverty Income Ceiling Index Scale (Alachua County, 1971). These standards were employed for the 1970-71 school year in the school system from which subjects for this study were obtained. Sources of information used to determine disadvantagement included permanent record folders, free or reduced price lunch applications, teacher observations, teacher judgments, health statistics, low rent housing statistics, and employment statistics.

Of the students identified as disadvantaged, 185 were Black and thirty-nine were White. The remaining 370 students were considered as nondisadvantaged for the purposes of this study. Thirty-seven of these students were Black and 333 were White.

For purposes of testing hypothesis nine, which was concerned with the commonality of the self report and the inferred instruments used in this study, only the scores of students in grades five and six were used. The scores of students in these two grades were also used for hypotheses testings of professed self concepts as learner. This sample included 199 students of whom seventy-two were Black and 127 were White. Of that total, eighty-one were disadvantaged (sixty-five Black; sixteen White) and 118 were nondisadvantaged (seven Black; 111 White).

Instruments

Two instruments were used for obtaining the self concept data for this study: the *Florida Key: A Scale to Infer Self Concept*, an observational scale, and the *Self Concept As A Learner--SCAL*, a self report instrument.

The *Florida Key* (see Appendix A) is an instrument for inferring students' self concepts as learner from teacher ratings of a student in regard to eighteen behavioral acts. The ratings are made according to the frequency with which the subject engages in each of these classroom behaviors. The instrument is constructed on a six-point scale ranging from *never* (zero) to *very often* (five). This instrument does not require the cooperation of the subject nor permit his awareness that he is being measured. Thus, it can easily be used with primary children and children with special characteristics such as the disadvantaged. Besides the total score, the *Florida Key* yields the following sub-scores: relating (five items), asserting (seven items), investing (two items), and coping (four items). A total split reliability coefficient of .93 and an interrater reliability of .84 have been obtained for this instrument (Purkey, Cage, & Graves, 1971). Validity of the *Florida Key* was judged by a panel of educators and psychologists.

The second instrument used for this study was the Self Concept As A Learner--SCAL (see Appendix B). It is a self report instrument consisting of fifty statements with the student response ranging on a five-point scale from completely false to completely true. The SCAL is divided into four components which constitute certain dimensions of a student's self concept as a learner. These components are: motivation (thirteen items), task orientation (thirteen items), problem solving (thirteen items), and class member (eleven items). A correlation of .87 was obtained for split half reliability. Two test-retest reliability studies yielded correlations of .90. A third study revealed a .80 correlation for test-retest reliability (Waetjen, 1967).

While these two instruments are different in method, they both appear to be constructed to measure the same dimensions of the self. Both of these measures are purported to assess the self concept as learner. Each instrument has had four components identified through factor analyses for which sub-scores can be obtained in addition to the total score. An examination of the items composing each factor for the two instruments found some apparent similarities between the four components of the Florida Key and the four components of the SCAL. The relating factor of the Florida Key (items 1 - 5) and the class member component of the SCAL (items 40 - 50) seem to be composed of similar items. The other factors of the two instruments appear to lend themselves to the following pairings: asserting--Florida Key (items 6 - 12) and task orientation--SCAL (items 14 - 26); investing--Florida Key (items 13 - 14) and motivation--SCAL (items 1 - 13); coping--Florida Key (items 15 - 18) and problem solving--SCAL (items 27 - 39).

Method

The Florida Key was used for inferring self concept as learner scores for all students in grades one through six, while the SCAL was used to obtain professed self concept scores from the fifth and sixth grade students.

All teachers in grades one through six in the school selected were asked to complete a Florida Key for each student in their homeroom. They were informed that it takes approximately five minutes to complete each student's rating, and that teachers should use their first impressions in making these ratings.

Each student in grades five and six were asked to complete a copy of the SCAL. Arrangements were made for the scale to be administered to each student in the homerooms of these two grades. Two people served as administrators. One read the instructions and each statement to the students as they completed the SCAL. The other assisted those students with questions pertaining to filling out the scale. Each student was told that the statements in the scale were to help them describe themselves and that the purpose of their completing the SCAL was to help researchers learn more about how boys and girls feel about themselves.

Statistical Analyses

For testing those hypotheses concerning the differences of self concept as learner between disadvantaged and nondisadvantaged and between Blacks and Whites (hypotheses 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8), multiple linear regression analysis was conducted.

To answer the question of the relationship between the two self concept as learner instruments (hypothesis 9), the following analyses were conducted: a correlation matrix of the factor scores and the total scores of the two instruments; a canonical correlation for the two instruments using the factor scores. In addition all items of both instruments were pooled and factor analyzed.

The .05 level of confidence was chosen for this study. The IBM 360/65 of the University of Florida was used with the University of Florida Educational Statistical Library and the Biomedical Computer Programs.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The major question asked by this study was: Do self concept as learner scores of disadvantaged elementary pupils differ significantly from those of nondisadvantaged elementary pupils? In addition to this major question, two related questions were also asked. One of these questions was concerned with differences in the scores of Blacks and Whites. The other question concerned the investigation of the relationship between two measures of self concept as learner.

The results of this study are presented in four sections. The first section contains the results of hypotheses testings of comparisons between the self concept as learner scores of disadvantaged and nondisadvantaged pupils. The results of hypotheses testings concerning differences between the scores of Blacks and Whites are reported in the next two sections. To test the differences between groups, the stepwise regression program of the Biomedical Computer Programs was used. This program computes a sequence of multiple linear regression equations in a stepwise manner.

The last part of Chapter Four presents the results of the testings of hypothesis nine which focused on the commonality of the two instruments. To test the relationship between the Florida Key and the Self Concept As A Learner Scale, a correlation matrix, factor analysis, and canonical correlation were obtained. For purposes of statistical testing, hypotheses were stated in the null form.

Comparisons Between Disadvantaged and Nondisadvantaged

Hypothesis 1

There is no significant difference between disadvantaged and nondisadvantaged pupils on inferred self concept as learner as measured by the Florida Key.

This null hypothesis was rejected since disadvantaged students scored significantly lower on all four factors of the Florida Key than did nondisadvantaged students. Table 1 displays the means and standard deviations for both disadvantaged and nondisadvantaged students on the Florida Key. F-ratios representing the differences between groups for scores on the Florida Key are found in Table 2.

Hypothesis 2

There is no significant difference between disadvantaged and nondisadvantaged pupils on professed self concept as learner as measured by the SCAL.

Disadvantaged students scored significantly lower on three of the four factors of the SCAL than did nondisadvantaged students, therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. The factor on which no significant difference was found was

TABLE 1

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF DISADVANTAGED AND NONDISADVANTAGED ON THE *FLORIDA KEY*

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation
Disadvantaged:		
1. Relating	16.83	4.38
2. Asserting	20.04	7.49
3. Investing	4.64	2.74
4. Coping	12.14	4.49
Nondisadvantaged:		
1. Relating	20.19	4.14
2. Asserting	23.85	7.44
3. Investing	6.24	3.33
4. Coping	14.74	4.22

TABLE 2

SUMMARY OF F-RATIOS FOR COMPARISONS OF DISADVANTAGED AND NONDISADVANTAGED, BLACKS AND WHITES, AND BLACKS AND WHITES WITHIN LEVELS ON THE FLORIDA KEY

		F-Ratios			
Source	df	Relating	Asserting	Investing	Coping
Disadvantagement	1	89.19***	35.99***	36.83***	50.71***
Race	1	75.76***	35.24*	30.40***	40.36***
Error	592				
Race within Disadvantaged	1	12.22***	0.69	0.53	0.86
Error	222				
Race within Nondisadvantaged	1	0.51	7.09**	3.49	3.80
Error	367				

Disadvantagement:	Disadvantaged; Nondisadvantaged
Race:	Black; White

*p $<$ .05
**p $<$ .01
***p $<$ .001

problem solving. Table 3 displays the means and standard deviations for both disadvantaged and nondisadvantaged students on the SCAL. The F-ratios representing differences between groups for scores on the SCAL are shown in Table 4.

Comparisons Between Blacks and Whites

Hypothesis 3

There is no significant difference between Black and White pupils on inferred self concept as learner as measured by the Florida Key.

Black students' scores on the Florida Key were significantly lower on all four factors than those of White students (Table 2). Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected. Means and standard deviations on the Florida Key for these two groups are shown in Table 5.

Hypothesis 4

There is no significant difference between Black and White pupils on professed self concept as learner as measured by the SCAL.

Since Black students' scores were significantly lower on three of the four SCAL factors than those of White students (Table 4), the null hypothesis was rejected. Problem solving was the factor on which no significant difference was found. Means and standard deviations for these two groups on the SCAL are shown in Table 6.

TABLE 3

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF DISADVANTAGED AND NONDISADVANTAGED ON THE SCAL

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation
Disadvantaged:		
1. Motivation	42.32	4.45
2. Task orientation	42.14	6.28
3. Problem solving	41.80	5.37
4. Class member	37.06	6.36
Nondisadvantaged:		
1. Motivation	43.94	4.30
2. Task orientation	46.05	6.72
3. Problem solving	41.46	6.17
4. Class member	40.52	5.66

TABLE 4

SUMMARY OF F-RATIOS FOR COMPARISONS OF DISADVANTAGED AND NONDISADVANTAGED, BLACKS AND WHITES, AND BLACKS AND WHITES WITHIN LEVELS ON THE SCAL

Source	df	F-Ratios Motivation	Task Orientation	Problem Solving	Class Member
Disadvantagement	1	5.84*	14.93***	0.11	13.50***
Race	1	9.80**	20.95***	0.30	22.80***
Error	197				
Race within Disadvantaged	1	1.12	2.58	1.10	4.44*
Error	79				
Race within Non-disadvantaged	1	2.28	2.02	0.81	1.48
Error	115				

Disadvantagement: Disadvantaged; Nondisadvantaged

Race: Black; White

*$p < .05$
**$p < .01$
***$p < .001$

TABLE 5

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF BLACKS AND WHITES ON THE *FLORIDA KEY*

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation
Blacks:		
1. Relating	17.00	4.32
2. Asserting	20.02	7.45
3. Investing	4.62	2.71
4. Coping	12.17	4.48
Whites:		
1. Relating	20.07	4.24
2. Asserting	23.84	7.46
3. Investing	6.22	3.34
4. Coping	14.69	4.25

TABLE 6

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF BLACKS AND WHITES ON THE SCAL

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation
Blacks:		
1. Motivation	42.01	4.37
2. Task orientation	41.68	6.10
3. Problem solving	41.29	5.63
4. Class member	36.50	6.23
Whites:		
1. Motivation	44.01	4.29
2. Task orientation	46.06	6.68
3. Problem solving	41.76	5.96
4. Class member	40.63	5.65

Comparisons of Blacks and Whites Within Disadvantagement Groups

Hypothesis 5

There is no significant difference between disadvantaged Black and disadvantaged White pupils on inferred self concept as learner as measured by the Florida Key.

A significant difference was obtained on only one factor of the Florida Key when disadvantaged Blacks and disadvantaged Whites were compared (Table 2). The null hypothesis was rejected. Disadvantaged Blacks scored Significantly lower on the relating factor. Means and standard deviations for these two groups on the Florida Key are shown in Table 7.

Hypothesis 6

There is no significant difference between disadvantaged Black and disadvantaged White pupils on professed self concept as learner as measured by the SCAL.

A significant difference was obtained on only one factor of the SCAL when disadvantaged Blacks and disadvantaged Whites were compared (Table 4). Disadvantaged Blacks scored significantly lower on class member. The null hypothesis was rejected. Means and standard deviations for these two groups on the SCAL are shown in Table 8.

Hypothesis 7

There is no significant difference between nondisadvan-

TABLE 7

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF DISADVANTAGED BLACKS AND DISADVANTAGED WHITES ON THE FLORIDA KEY

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation
Disadvantaged Blacks:		
1. Relating	16.42	4.27
2. Asserting	19.85	7.46
3. Investing	4.51	2.75
4. Coping	11.93	4.53
Disadvantaged Whites:		
1. Relating	18.79	4.38
2. Asserting	20.92	7.68
3. Investing	5.23	2.62
4. Coping	13.13	4.22

TABLE 8

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF DISADVANTAGED BLACKS AND DISADVANTAGED WHITES ON THE SCAL

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation
Disadvantaged Blacks:		
1. Motivation	42.06	4.30
2. Task orientation	41.58	6.41
3. Problem solving	41.49	5.76
4. Class member	36.34	6.35
Disadvantaged Whites:		
1. Motivation	43.38	5.00
2. Task orientation	44.38	5.37
3. Problem solving	43.06	3.15
4. Class member	40.00	5.65

taged Black and nondisadvantaged White pupils on inferred self concept as learner as measured by the Florida Key.

Nondisadvantaged Blacks scored significantly lower than nondisadvantaged Whites on only the asserting factor of the Florida Key (Table 2). The null hypothesis was rejected. No significant differences were found between these two groups on the other three factors of the Florida Key. Means and standard deviations for these two groups on the Florida Key are shown in Table 9.

Hypothesis 8

There is no significant difference between nondisadvantaged Black and nondisadvantaged White pupils on professed self concept as learner as measured by the SCAL.

No significant differences were found between nondisadvantaged Blacks and nondisadvantaged Whites on the SCAL (Table 4). Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected. Means and standard deviations for these two groups on the SCAL are shown in Table 10.

Relationship Between the FLORIDA KEY and the SCAL

Hypothesis 9

Fifth and sixth grade students' scores on the Florida Key are not significantly correlated with their scores on the SCAL.

To test the relationship of the two measures of self concept as learner, three different analyses were made. A

TABLE 9

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF NONDISADVANTAGED BLACKS AND NONDISADVANTAGED WHITES ON THE FLORIDA KEY

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation
Nondisadvantaged Blacks:		
1. Relating	19.73	3.56
2. Asserting	20.78	7.33
3. Investing	5.27	2.42
4. Coping	13.46	4.00
Nondisadvantaged Whites:		
1. Relating	20.22	4.21
2. Asserting	24.18	7.38
3. Investing	6.34	3.40
4. Coping	14.87	4.22

TABLE 10

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF NONDISADVANTAGED BLACKS AND NONDISADVANTAGED WHITES ON THE SCAL

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation
Nondisadvantaged Blacks:		
1. Motivation	41.57	5.35
2. Task orientation	42.57	1.40
3. Problem solving	39.43	4.08
4. Class member	38.00	5.10
Nondisadvantaged Whites:		
1. Motivation	44.10	4.19
2. Task orientation	46.30	6.84
3. Problem solving	41.58	6.25
4. Class member	40.72	5.67

matrix of the correlations between the factors of the Florida Key and the SCAL was produced. The canonical correlation analysis was also conducted on the factor scores of the two measures. In addition, all items of both instruments were pooled together and factor analyzed. Null hypothesis nine was rejected as significant correlations were obtained. The results of all three of these analyses, however, showed little commonality between the Florida Key and the SCAL.

Table 11 shows the correlation matrix of the factors previously reported for the two instruments used in this study. The correlations ranged from .08 to .41. All but three of these correlations were significant. The extent to which these measures account for the commonality of the two variables, however, can be determined by squaring the correlation. For example, the correlation of .41 between coping (Florida Key) and class member (SCAL), which was the highest correlation, accounts for only about seventeen per cent commonality between these two variables.

The means and standard deviations for scores on each factor of the Florida Key and the SCAL are displayed in Table 12. Three phases of calculating the canonical correlation are shown in Tables 13, 14, and 15. The correlation between a single score on the Florida Key and a single score on the SCAL was .08. One significant canonical correlation was found. The maximum canonical correlation was .44 which would indicate about twenty per cent commonality in what the two instruments measured.

TABLE 11

CORRELATION MATRIX OF FLORIDA KEY AND SCAL SCORES

	Florida Key				
	Relating	Asserting	Investing	Coping	Total
SCAL					
Motivation	.18*	.08	.17*	.20**	.19*
Task Orientation	.26**	.20**	.23**	.35**	.32**
Problem Solving	.20**	.08	.10	.18*	.17*
Class Member	.38**	.20**	.31**	.41**	.38**
Total	.08	.03	.07	.07	.07

$^{*}p < .05$
$^{**}p < .01$

TABLE 12

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR FIFTH AND SIXTH GRADE STUDENTS ON THE FLORIDA KEY AND SCAL

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation
Florida Key:		
1. Relating	18.58	4.67
2. Asserting	23.08	7.05
3. Investing	5.75	2.49
4. Coping	13.49	4.48
5. Total	61.05	15.67
SCAL		
1. Motivation	43.29	4.41
2. Task orientation	44.47	6.80
3. Problem solving	41.59	5.83
4. Class member	39.14	6.18
5. Total	178.20	56.55

TABLE 13

CORRELATION MATRIX OF FLORIDA KEY AND SCAL FACTORS

	Florida Key				SCAL			
	Relating	Asserting	Investing	Coping	Motivation	Task Orientation	Problem Solving	Class Member
Florida Key:								
Relating	1.00	0.46	0.57	0.78	0.18	0.24	0.18	0.35
Asserting	0.46	1.00	0.68	0.52	0.09	0.17	0.06	0.18
Investing	0.57	0.68	1.00	0.68	0.17	0.20	0.08	0.28
Coping	0.78	0.52	0.68	1.00	0.20	0.34	0.17	0.40
SCAL:								
Motivation	0.18	0.09	0.17	0.20	1.00	0.37	0.17	0.27
Task Orientation	0.24	0.17	0.20	0.34	0.37	1.00	0.51	0.54
Problem Solving	0.18	0.06	0.08	0.17	0.17	0.51	1.00	0.47
Class Member	0.35	0.18	0.28	0.40	0.27	0.54	0.47	1.00

TABLE 14

CANONICAL CORRELATIONS OF FLORIDA KEY AND SCAL FACTORS

	Canonical R
1	0.442
2	0.180
3	0.084
4	0.001

TABLE 15

α AND β WEIGHTS FOR THE SIGNIFICANT CANONICAL R

Florida Key	α	SCAL	β
Relating	0.074	Motivation	0.153
Asserting	-1.125	Task orientation	0.387
Investing	0.098	Problem solving	-0.201
Coping	0.937	Class member	0.772

All items of both instruments were pooled and factor analyzed. Four, five, six, and seven factors were rotated to varimax criterion with loadings less than .40 suppressed. As can be seen in Tables 16, 17, 18, and 19, a relatively clear factor structure emerged with each successive rotation. It should be noted that the first eighteen items in each table were those from the Florida Key with the remainder of the items listed coming from the SCAL. It is clearly evident from these rotations that the two instruments are measuring different dimensions of the self concept as learner. In all four rotations none of the Florida Key items and the SCAL items appeared in the same factors. When four factors were rotated, factors one and four were composed of Florida Key items with factors two and three being made up of SCAL items (Table 16). A similar pattern resulted with each rotation (Tables 17, 18, and 19). The Florida Key items continued to be located in two of the factors with the other factors being composed of SCAL items.

The rotation of four, five, six, and seven factors accounted for 52.13, 56.38, 59.65, and 62.75 per cent of all common variance respectively. Similarly, 32.84, 35.52, 37.58, and 39.53 per cent of the total score variance was accounted for by the rotations.

In summary, this chapter has presented the statistical analyses of the data. The results of this study showed disadvantaged students to score significantly lower on all four factors of the Florida Key than nondisadvantaged students.

TABLE 16

ROTATED FACTOR LOADINGS FOR FLORIDA KEY AND SCAL ITEMS WHEN POOLED TOGETHER--FOUR FACTORS ROTATED

Item	F1	F2	F3	F4
1	.73			
2	.78			
3	.59			
4	.70			.42
5	.72			
6				.78
7				.87
8				.84
9				.75
10	.47			.48
11	.52			.64
12	.42			.61
13	.61			.57
14	.58			.56
15	.81			
16	.83			
17	.86			
18	.70			
26			.48	

TABLE 16 (Cont'd)

Item	F1	F2	F3	F4
27			.54	
30		.53		
31		.43		
32			.48	
35		.46		
36			.48	
37			.52	
38		.52		
39			.51	
40		.49		
43			.47	
44			.51	
45			.59	
46		.59		
48		.45		
49			.44	
51		.65		
54		.43		
55		.50		
56		.41		
57		.40		
59		.57		
61		.45		

TABLE 16 (Cont'd)

Item	F1	F2	F3	F4
62		.47		
63		.43		
67			.50	
68			.60	

TABLE 17

ROTATED FACTOR LOADINGS FOR FLORIDA KEY AND SCAL ITEMS WHEN POOLED TOGETHER--FIVE FACTORS ROTATED

Item	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5
1	.71				
2	.80				
3	.64				
4	.71			.42	
5	.76				
6				.79	
7				.88	
8				.87	
9				.77	
10	.45			.51	
11	.49			.67	
12				.63	
13	.58			.59	
14	.57			.58	
15	.79				
16	.82				
17	.84				
18	.63				
26			.48		

TABLE 17 (Cont'd)

Item	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5
27			.54		
30		.52			
31		.45			
32			.48		
35		.45			
36			.48		
37			.52		
38		.53			
39			.52		
40		.49			
43			.47		
44			.51		
45			.59		
46		.58			
48		.45			
49			.44		
51		.64			
54		.41			
55		.49			
59		.57			
61		.45			
62		.48			
63		.43			

TABLE 17 (Cont'd)

Item	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5
64.					.53
67			.50		
68			.60		

TABLE 18

ROTATED FACTOR LOADINGS FOR FLORIDA KEY AND SCAL ITEMS WHEN POOLED TOGETHER--SIX FACTORS ROTATED

Item	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6
1	.71					
2	.81					
3	.64					
4	.72			.42		
5	.76					
6				.78		
7				.87		
8				.87		
9				.78		
10	.45			.51		
11	.48			.67		
12				.64		
13	.58			.60		
14	.56			.58		
15	.79					
16	.82					
17	.85					
18	.63					
21					.48	

TABLE 18 (Cont'd)

Item	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6
25					.44	
26			.48			
27			.54			
30		.52				
31		.45				
32			.48			
35		.48				
36			.48			
37			.52			
38		.52				
39			.51			
40		.47				
42			.40			
43			.47			
44			.50			
45			.60			
46		.57				
48		.43				
49			.44			
51		.66				
54						.42
55		.52				
58						.40

TABLE 18 (Cont'd)

Item	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6
59		.57				
61		.45				
62		.48				
63		.42				
64						.45
67			.49			
68			.59			

TABLE 19

ROTATED FACTOR LOADINGS FOR *FLORIDA KEY* AND *SCAL* ITEMS WHEN POOLED TOGETHER--SEVEN FACTORS ROTATED

Item	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7
1	.71						
2	.81						
3	.64						
4	.71			.43			
5	.76						
6				.78			
7				.87			
8				.87			
9				.78			
10	.44			.51			
11	.48			.67			
12				.64			
13	.57			.60			
14	.56			.59			
15	.79						
16	.82						
17	.84						
18	.62						
25					.51		

TABLE 19 (Cont'd)

Item	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7
26			.42		-.42		
27			.51				
30		.51					
31		.49					
32			.51				
35		.44					
36			.48				
37			.52				
38		.56					
39			.49				
40		.59					
41						.42	
42			.42				
43			.43				
44			.49				
45			.61				
46		.48					
48		.41					
49			.45				
51		.65					
56							.53
57							.54
59		.49					

TABLE 19 (Cont'd)

Item	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7
61		.43					
62		.46					
63		.47					
64							.54
67			.52				
68			.60				

Disadvantaged students scored significantly lower than nondisadvantaged students on three of the four factors of the SCAL. The factor on which no significant differences were found was problem solving. In the comparisons between Blacks and Whites, Black students obtained scores that were significantly lower than those of White students on all four factors of the Florida Key. Black students' scores were significantly lower than those of White students on three of the four SCAL factors. The factor on which no significant differences were found was problem solving. Disadvantaged Blacks, when compared to disadvantaged Whites, scored significantly lower on the relating factor of the Florida Key. Disadvantaged Blacks, when compared to disadvantaged Whites, scored significantly lower on the class member factor of the SCAL. Nondisadvantaged Blacks scored significantly lower than nondisadvantaged Whites on the asserting factor of the Florida Key. No significant differences were found between nondisadvantaged Blacks and nondisadvantaged Whites on the SCAL.

When comparing the Florida Key with the SCAL, several low but significant correlations were found among factors of the two instruments although the commonality represented by these correlations was small. The pooled factor analysis resulted in the items of the two instruments being located in separate factors. A canonical correlation of .44 was calculated indicating about twenty per cent common variance.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND CONCLUSIONS

The primary objective of this study was to investigate the relationship of self concepts as learner of disadvantaged and nondisadvantaged elementary school pupils. In addition, the relationship between the self concepts as learner of Blacks and Whites was explored.

This study focused on a more specific dimension of the self concept, the self concept as learner, and employed both inferred and professed self concept as learner measures. A secondary objective of this study was to determine the extent to which the SCAL, a self report instrument, and the Florida Key, an inferential, behavioral rating scale, measured common aspects of the self concept as learner.

The data for this study were obtained at an elementary school in North Central Florida. Inferred self concept as learner scores were obtained on the Florida Key for students in grades one through six. There were 594 students for whom inferred scores were obtained. Two hundred twenty-four of these students were identified as disadvantaged. Professed self concept as learner scores were obtained on the SCAL for students in grades five and six. There were 199 students for whom professed scores were obtained. Eighty-one of these students were determined to be disadvantaged.

For detecting the differences of self concept as learner between the disadvantaged and nondisadvantaged and between Blacks and Whites, multiple linear regression analyses were conducted. To answer the question of the relationship between the two self concept as learner instruments, all items of both instruments were pooled together and factor analyzed. A canonical correlation analysis and correlational matrix of the scores of the factors previously reported for these instruments were also used for determining the relationship of the two instruments.

The _Florida Key_ and _SCAL_ each measure four dimensions of self concept as learner. The dimensions measured by the _Florida Key_ are: _relating_, _asserting_, _investing_, and _coping_. The _SCAL_ measures the following dimensions: _motivation_, _task orientation_, _problem solving_, and _class member_.

For investigating the relationship between self concept as learner and disadvantagement, two hypotheses were tested:

(1) There is a significant difference between disadvantaged and nondisadvantaged pupils on _inferred_ self concept as learner as measured by the _Florida Key_.

(2) There is a significant difference between disadvantaged and nondisadvantaged pupils on _professed_ self concept as learner as measured by the _SCAL_.

The following hypotheses were tested for determining racial differences in self concept as learner scores:

(3) There is a significant difference between Black

and White pupils on inferred self concept as learner as measured by the Florida Key.

(4) There is a significant difference between Black and White pupils on professed self concept as learner as measured by the SCAL.

(5) There is a significant difference between disadvantaged Black and disadvantaged White pupils on inferred self concept as learner as measured by the Florida Key.

(6) There is a significant difference between disadvantaged Black and disadvantaged White pupils on professed self concept as learner as measured by the SCAL.

(7) There is a significant difference between nondisadvantaged Black and nondisadvantaged White pupils on inferred self concept as learner as measured by the Florida Key.

(8) There is a significant difference between nondisadvantaged Black and nondisadvantaged White pupils on professed self concept as learner as measured by the SCAL.

For exploring the commonality between the Florida Key and the SCAL, the following hypothesis was tested:

(9) Fifth and sixth grade students' scores on the Florida Key correlate significantly with their scores on the SCAL.

Summary of Results

Multiple linear regression analysis revealed the following results in testing hypotheses 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8. When disadvantaged pupils' inferred self concept as learner scores were compared to those of nondisadvantaged pupils', significant differences were found. Disadvantaged students' scores were significantly lower on all four dimensions of the Florida Key. Similar differences were found when fifth and sixth grade disadvantaged and nondisadvantaged students were compared according to their professed self concepts as learner. The disadvantaged pupils obtained lower professed scores on all four dimensions of the SCAL. The differences were significant on all but one of the four dimension, problem solving.

The results of comparisons between Black and White students were similar to those of comparisons between disadvantaged and nondisadvantaged pupils. Significant differences were found between Black students' inferred scores and those of White students. Black students scored significantly lower on all four dimensions of the Florida Key. When fifth and sixth grade Black and White students' professed scores were compared, Black students were found to have significantly lower scores on three of the four dimensions of the SCAL. Blacks also scored lower on the other dimension, problem solving.

When students were compared by race within socioeconomic groups, the differences between Blacks and Whites were less pronounced. While disadvantaged Black pupils scored lower than disadvantaged White pupils on all of the *Florida Key* dimensions, only one difference was significant. Significant differences resulted on the *relating* factor. Similarly, disadvantaged Black students obtained lower scores on all the dimensions of the *SCAL* with one of these factor scores, *class member*, being significantly lower. Comparisons between Blacks and Whites within the nondisadvantaged group showed Black pupils as having lower scores on all four dimensions of the *Florida Key* with only one of them being significantly lower than that obtained by nondisadvantaged White students. The factor on which significant differences were found was *asserting*. No significant differences were found on any of the *SCAL* dimensions between nondisadvantaged Black and nondisadvantaged White students although Black pupils did obtain lower scores on all four factors.

The correlation matrix of the *Florida Key* and the *SCAL* factors revealed correlations ranging from .08 to .41 with all but three of these correlations being significant at the .05 level. The highest correlation (.41) was between the *coping* factor of the *Florida Key* and the *class member* factor of the *SCAL*. This correlation of .41 indicated that there was only about seventeen per cent commonality between these two dimensions. A correlation of .08 was found between a single score on one instrument and a single score on the other instrument. A significant canonical correlation of .44 was found which suggests that of what the two instruments measured, only about twenty per cent of it was common to each instrument.

Factor analysis of all items from both instruments pooled together showed the items of the Florida Key to be clearly differentiated from those of the SCAL. None of the Florida Key items appeared with any of the SCAL items in the same factors on any rotation.

Discussion

Self concept research and literature stress the importance of a positive self concept as learner in school achievement. The disadvantaged child's poor school achievement has been a major concern of educators in recent years. Many attempts have been made to improve the disadvantaged student's school achievement by enhancing his self conceptions. It has been assumed that the disadvantaged student, due to his more impoverished living conditions, possesses negative self concepts and it is for this reason that he achieves poorly in school.

The results of this study indicate that the disadvantaged student does see himself negatively as a learner. The disadvantaged students in this study not only reflected such negative self conceptions through their classroom behavior, but also professed to have these negative feelings. Inferences drawn from the disadvantaged child's classroom behavior characterize him as having negative feelings in four dimensions of the self concept as learner. He appears to see himself as being deficient in his relations with others in school. He seems to feel unable to assert himself in acceptable ways in the school environment and perceives himself as being unable to invest in and cope with school activities.

This study found that the disadvantaged child, when compared to the nondisadvantaged child, professes negative beliefs in three areas of self concept as learner. He sees himself as an inadequate member of his class and perceives himself as unable to complete school-related tasks. He also characterizes himself as lacking in motivation toward achieving in school. The disadvantaged children in this study, however, did not characterize themselves as being low in one dimension of professed self concept as learner, the ability to solve problems. There appears to be several possible explanations for this inconsistent finding. An examination of the items comprising the problem-solving factor seem to indicate that these items, more so than the items on the other factors, are related to the student's perception of his ability. It could be that the disadvantaged child is more defensive about his ability to solve problems and thus, he presented a more positive picture of himself in this respect. A second alternative is the possibility that the disadvantaged child actually views himself more positively as a solver of problems because of prior success at solving problems in other aspects of his life. Another possibility is that he actually has a distorted perception of his ability to solve problems. The most probable explanation, however, seems to be some combination of the above.

Although overall comparisons of Black and White students showed Black students as possessing more negative self concepts as learner, it was concluded that a student's socioeconomic conditions are more strongly related to negative self conceptions as learner than his race. The overall comparisons between Black and White students revealed almost identical results as those found between disadvantaged and nondisadvantaged students. This similarity is logical since the majority of the disadvantaged students in the sample for this study were Black and the majority of the nondisadvantaged students were White.

The results of comparisons between races within the disadvantaged group, however, revealed less pronounced differences in self concept as learner. Disadvantaged Black students' classroom behavior reflected more negative self perceptions on only one of the four dimensions of inferred self concept as learner. The Black student within the disadvantaged group appears to see himself as less adequate in his relationships with others in the school setting than the White student in this group. Out of the four dimensions of professed self concept as learner, the disadvantaged Black pupil reported more negative feelings than the disadvantaged White pupil on only one dimension. The disadvantaged Black student professed more negative feelings than the disadvantaged White student in regard to his role as a class member.

Both of these dimensions are composed of items concerning the student's relations with other people. It seems that the disadvantaged Black student is less likely than the disadvantaged White student to feel good about himself in this area.

When comparing differences between races within the nondisadvantaged group, even fewer differences occurred. It was inferred from the classroom behavior of the nondisadvantaged Black pupil that he had a more negative view in relation to only one of the four inferred self concept as learner dimensions. The nondisadvantaged Black student seems to see himself as less able than the nondisadvantaged White student to assert himself in school-related activities. When professing self concept as learner, the nondisadvantaged Black student indicated no more negative feelings than the nondisadvantaged White student.

The results of this study indicate that a student's scores on the factors of the Florida Key are related to his scores on the factors of the SCAL. It was also shown that a student's scores on the factors of the SCAL are related to his total score on the Florida Key. The factor scores of the Florida Key, however, are not related to the total score of the SCAL. Correlations between the scores for the four factors of the Florida Key and the four factor scores of the SCAL reveal thirteen statistically significant relationships (see Table 11). Two factors on each instrument correlated significantly with all four of the factors on the other instrument. The relating and coping factors of the Florida

Key appear to be measuring some of the same aspects of self concept as learner as all four of the SCAL factors. Similarly the SCAL factors of task orientation and class member measure some of the same variables that are measured by each of the Florida Key factors. All of the factors of each instrument show some commonality with two or more of the factors of the other instrument.

While most of the factors of one instrument were found to be related to the factors of the other instrument, at best, only about twenty per cent of the variability in the score on a factor of one instrument could be accounted for by the score on a factor of the other instrument. A student's score on an individual item of one measure seems to have no relationship to his score on items of the other instrument. The results of this study indicated that the Florida Key and the SCAL measured some related aspects of self concepts as learner; however, most of what was measured by one of these instruments appeared to have little commonality with what was measured by the other instrument.

Conclusions

There were three main conclusions stemming from the results of this study. It was concluded that the disadvantaged student feels more negative about himself as a learner than the nondisadvantaged student. The second major conclusion of this study was that negative self concept as a learner is more closely associated with a student's socioeconomic conditions than with his race. The third major conclusion was that the Florida Key and the SCAL measured some common aspects of the self concept as learner, although in terms of what they measured, the two instruments are more different than they are alike.

The results of this study imply that educators involved in programs for improving the school achievement of the disadvantaged should continue to stress the enhancement of the self concept as a vital part of such programs. The development of strong self concepts has been an objective of most of the programs for the disadvantaged; however, the implications of this study are that a more specific self concept, self concept as learner, should be strengthened so that academic achievement for the disadvantaged student will be upgraded.

The low degree of relationship between the Florida Key and the SCAL could be attributed to the basic difference between inferred and professed methods of measurement. While these two instruments appear to measure some similar self dimensions, the view that inferred and professed instruments should not be treated as equivalent measures was supported by the results of this study.

Another possible explanation for the differences between the Florida Key and the SCAL is that the professed score represents a broader context of the self concept as learner than the Florida Key score. It seems logical to assume that the student evaluates his self feelings in light of his overall experiences at school, while the sample of his self perceptions represented by the teacher's ratings of significant classroom behaviors represents a more specific aspect of his self concept as learner.

The first conclusion implies that the use of a combination of both self report and inferred instruments is a necessity in gaining more accurate measurements of the self concept as learner. The employment of both techniques decreases the possibility of research findings being the results of the characteristics of one particular measurement method.

The second conclusion has implications for further research in comparing inferred and professed measurements. By requesting that the student report his self perceptions in light of the specific classroom setting from which the teacher observes and rates his classroom behaviors, a more direct comparison of the inferred and professed methods of measuring self concept as learner could be made.

It is hoped that future studies will explore means for enhancing the disadvantaged child's self concept as learner. The disadvantaged pupil's attainment of a more positive self concept as learner might well be an essential step in the improvement of his school achievement. It is also hoped that researchers will not continue to depend on a single measurement method for obtaining self concept indices, but will employ a combination of inferred and professed procedures.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

FLORIDA KEY

FLORIDA KEY

William W. Purkey Bob N. Cage
William Graves
University of Florida April 1971

This scale is to assist you, the teacher, in evaluating how the student perceives his or her "learner" self. Please select one of the following answers and record the number in the blank space.

NEVER: 0 VERY SELDOM: 1 ONCE IN AWHILE: 2 OCCASIONALLY: 3 FAIRLY OFTEN: 4 VERY OFTEN: 5

____
Name of Student to be Evaluated

Compared with other students his age, does this student:

1. get along with other students? ____
2. get along with the teacher? ____
3. keep calm when things go wrong? ____
4. say good things about his school? ____
5. tell the truth about his school work? ____

Relating ______

6. speak up for his own ideas? ____
7. offer to speak in front of the class? ____
8. offer to answer questions in class? ____
9. ask meaningful questions in class? ____
10. look people in the eye? ____
11. talk to others about his school work? ____
12. join in school activities? ____

Asserting ______

13. seek out new things to do in school on his own? ____
14. offer to do extra work in school? ____

Investing ______

15. finish his school work? ____
16. pay attention to class activities? ____
17. do his school work carefully? ____
18. read in class? ____

Coping ______

TOTAL ________

APPENDIX B

SELF CONCEPT AS A LEARNER SCALE

SELF CONCEPT AS A LEARNER SCALE*

Copyright 1967, Walter B. Waetjen
University of Maryland

Name____________________
Section_________________
Date____________________

Instructions: These statements are to help you describe yourself. Please answer them as if you were describing yourself to yourself. Do not omit any items! Read each statement carefully; then select one of the following answers; and next record the number that represents that particular answer in the blank space at the end of that statement.

Responses:	Completely True	Mostly True	Partly True and Partly False	Mostly False	Completely False
Number:	5	4	3	2	1

Remember you are not trying to describe yourself as others see you, but only as you see yourself.

1. I am usually eager to go to class. ________
2. I never ask teachers to explain something again. ________
3. I try to change when I know I'm doing things wrong. ________
4. I wish I didn't give up as easily as I do. ________
5. I get my work done, but I don't do extra work. ________
6. I would rather do well than poorly in school. ________
7. Once in a while I put off until tomorrow what I should do today. ________
8. I become discouraged easily in school. ________
9. I give up easily in school work. ________

---

*Not to be reproduced without author's permission.

Responses:	Completely True	Mostly True	Partly True and Partly False	Mostly False	Completely False
Number:	5	4	3	2	1

10. I do things without being told several times. ________

11. I am satisfied to be just what I am. ________

12. I like school jobs which give me responsibility. ________

13. I like to start work on new things. ________

14. I cannot remember directions for doing things. ________

15. I do well when I work alone. ________

16. I am satisfied with my ability to speak before class. ________

17. I am able to get my work done on time. ________

18. I have difficulty deciding what to study. ________

19. I sometimes use unfair means to do my school work. ________

20. I do my share of school work. ________

21. I give up if I don't understand something. ________

22. I try to be careful about my work. ________

23. I get tense when I'm called on in class. ________

24. I make mistakes because I don't listen. ________

25. I do things without thinking. ________

26. I have trouble deciding what is right. ________

27. I find it hard to remember things. ________

28. I think clearly about school work. ________

29. I can't express my ideas in writing very well. ________

30. I can tell the difference between important and unimportant things in a lesson. ________

31. I do poorly in tests and homework. ________

32. I change my mind a lot. ________

Responses:	Completely True	Mostly True	Partly True and Partly False	Mostly False	Completely False
Number:	5	4	3	2	1

33. I feel good about my school work. ________

34. I do not understand what is going on in class. ________

35. I am as smart as I want to be. ________

36. I solve problems quite easily. ________

37. I can figure things out for myself. ________

38. Good grades come easily to me. ________

39. I know the answer before the rest of the class. ________

40. I can usually see the sense in other's suggestions. ________

41. I find it easy to get along with classmates. ________

42. I enjoy being part of the class without taking the lead. ________

43. I take an active part in group projects and activities. ________

44. I try to play fair with my classmates. ________

45. I try to understand the other fellow's point of view. ________

46. I am an important person to my classmates. ________

47. My classmates have no confidence in me. ________

48. I am not interested in what my classmates do. ________

49. I find it hard to talk with my classmates. ________

50. I feel left out of things in class. ________

Inquiries concerning the *Self Concept As A Learner Scale* should be sent to Dr. Walter Waetjen, Vice President for General Administration, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alachua County Office of Public Instruction. Title I poverty income ceiling index scale for use in identifying economically deprived students for fiscal year ending June 30, 1972. Memo to Alachua County principals, Gainesville, Fla., February 1971.

Alberti, J. M. Self-perception-in-school. Paper presented at the meeting of the Northern Educational Research Association, Grossinger, N. Y., November 1970.

Allport, G. W. *Personality: A psychological interpretation.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1937.

Allport, G. W. *Becoming.* New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1955.

Ausubel, D. P., & Ausubel, P. Ego development among segregated Negro children. In H. A. Passow (Ed.), *Education in depressed areas.* New York: Bureau of Publications, Columbia University, 1963.

Bertocci, P. A. The psychological self, the ego and personality. *Psychological Review*, 1945, *52*, 91-99.

Bledsoe, J. Self concept of children and their intelligence, achievement interests and anxiety. *Childhood Education*, 1967, *43*, 436-438.

Brookover, W. B., & Erickson, E. L. *Society, schools, and learning.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1969.

Brookover, W. B., Erickson, E. L., & Joiner, L. M. *Self concept of ability and school achievement. III: Relationship of self concept to achievement in high school.* U. S. Office of Education, Cooperative Research Project No. 2831. East Lansing: Office of Research and Publications, Michigan State University, 1967.

Brookover, W. B., Patterson, A., & Thomas, S. *Self concept of ability and school achievement. II: Improving academic achievement through students' self concept enhancement.* U. S. Office of Education, Cooperative Research Project No. 1636. East Lansing: Office of Research and Publications, Michigan State University, 1965.

Brown, B. R. The assessment of self concept among four year old Negro and White children: A comparative study using the *Brown-Ids Self Concept Referents Test*. New York University, ERIC: ED 036 378, 1966.

Campbell, P. B. School and self concept. *Education Leadership*, 1967, *24*, 510-515.

Caplin, M. D. The relationship between self concept and academic achievement and between level of aspiration and academic achievement. *Dissertation Abstracts*, 1966, *27*, 979-A.

Caplin, M. D. Self concept, level of aspiration, and academic achievement. *Journal of Negro Education*, 1968, *27*, 435-439.

Carpenter, T. R., & Busse, T. B. Development of self concept in Negro and White welfare children. *Child Development*, 1969, *40*, 935-939.

Cattell, R. B. *Personality: A systematic, theoretical, and factual study*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1950.

Coleman, J. C., et al. *Equality of education opportunity*. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

Coller, A. R. The assessment of "self concept" in early childhood education. Urbana: ERIC Clearinghouse on Early Childhood Education, University of Illinois, 1971.

Combs, A. W. Snygg and Combs' phenomenal self. In C. S. Hall & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *Theories of personality*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1970.

Combs, A. W., Avila, D. L., & Purkey, W. W. *Helping relationships: Basic concepts for the helping profession*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.

Combs, A. W., Courson, C. C., & Soper, D. W. The measurement of self concept and self report. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 1963, *23*, 493-500.

Combs, A. W., & Snygg, D. *Individual behavior*. (2nd ed.) New York: Harper & Row, 1959.

Combs, A. W., & Soper, D. W. The self, its derivate terms, and research. *Journal of Individual Psychology*, 1957, *13*, 135-145.

Combs, A. W., & Soper, D. W. *The relationship of early child perceptions to achievement and behavior in the early school years*. U. S. Office of Education, Cooperative Research Project No. 814. Washington, D. C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1963.

Combs, C. F. A study of the relationship between certain perceptions of self and scholastic underachievement in academically capable high school boys. *Dissertation Abstracts*, 1963, *24*, 620.

Cook, K. E. *Differences between self concepts of disadvantaged and nondisadvantaged high school students within certain types of rural and urban communities. Final report*. U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C.: Bureau of Research, 1970.

Cooley, C. H. *Human nature and the social order*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1902.

Coopersmith, S. *The antecedents of self esteem*. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman, 1967.

Debiassie, R. R., & Healy, G. W. *Self concept: A comparison of Spanish-American, Negro, and Anglo adolescents across ethnic, sex, and socioeconomic variables*. U. S. Office of Education. Washington, D. C.: Bureau of Research, 1970.

Deutsch, M. The disadvantaged child and the learning process. In H. A. Passow (Ed.), *Education in depressed areas*. New York: Bureau of Publications, Columbia University, 1963.

Dewey, J. *Psychology*. (3rd ed.) New York: Harper & Row, 1891.

Diggory, J. C. *Self-evaluation: Concepts and studies*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1966.

DiLorenzo, L. T. *Prekindergarten programs for educationally disadvantaged children*. New York State Education Department. New York: Office of Research and Evaluation, 1969.

Durr, W. K., & Schmatz, R. R. Personality differences between high-achieving and low-achieving gifted children. *Reading Teacher*, 1964, *17*, 251-254.

Egbert, R. L., Ballif, B. L., & Hendrix, L. J. Self-identification of preschool children by socioeconomic levels. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 1968, *36*, 42-45.

Felker, D. W., & Kay, R. S. Self concept, sports interests, sports participation, and body type of seventh and eighth grade boys. *The Journal of Psychology*, 1971, *78*, 223-228.

Fink, W. F. Self concept as it relates to academic achievement. *California Journal of Educational Research*, 1962, *13*, 57-62.

Fitts, W. H., & Hamner, W. T. The self concept and delinquency. *Nashville Mental Health Center, Research Monographs*, 1969, No. 1.

Gill, M. P. Pattern of achievement as related to the perceived self. Paper read at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association Convention, Los Angeles, February 1969.

Goff, R. M. Some educational implications of the influence of rejection on aspiration levels of minority group children. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 1954, *23*, 179-183.

Goldberg, M. L. Studies in underachievement among the academically talented. In A. Frazier (Ed.), *Freeing capacity to learn*. Fourth ASCD Research Institute. Washington, D. C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development; National Education Association, 1960.

Graves, W. H. *A multivariate investigation of professed and inferred self concepts of fifth and sixth grade students*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1972.

Greenberg, J. W. Comments on self-perceptions of disadvantaged children. *American Educational Research Journal*, 1970, *7*, 627-630.

Harding, K. L. *A comparative study of Caucasian male high school students who stay in school and those who drop out*. Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1966.

Havighurst, R. J., & Moorefield, T. E. The disadvantaged in industrial cities. In P. S. Witty (Ed.), *The educationally retarded and disadvantaged*. Sixty-sixth yearbook, Part I. Chicago, Ill.: National Society for the Study of Education, 1967.

Heilbrun, A. B. The social desirability variable: Implications for test reliability and validity. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 1965, *25*, 745-756.

Hilgard, E. R. Human motives and the concept of the self. American Psychologist, 1949, 4, 374-382.

Hodgkins, B. J., & Stakenas, R. G. Study of self concept of Negro and White youth in segregated environments. Journal of Negro Education, 1969, 38, 370-377.

Irwin, F. S. Sentence completion responses and scholastic success or failure. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1967, 14, 269-271.

James, W. Principles of psychology. Magnolia, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1890. 2 vols.

Kozol, J. Death at an early age. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1967.

LaBenne, W. D., & Greene, B. I. Educational implications of self concept theory. Pacific Palisades, Calif.: Goodyear Publishing, 1969.

Larson, W. L., & Slocum, W. I. The impact of poverty on rural youth: An analysis of the relationship between family income and educational aspirations, self concept performance, and values of rural high school students. Washington State University, 1969.

Lecky, P. Self-consistency: A theory of personality. New York: Island Press, 1945.

Lewin, K. Principles of topological psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1936.

Long, B. H. The self concept of Negro and White school beginners. Paper presented for symposium: Self-other orientations of Negro and White students, Annual Meeting, American Educational Research Association, Chicago, February 1968.

Long, B. H. Critique of Soares and Soares' "Self-perceptions of culturally disadvantaged children." American Educational Research Journal, 1969, 6, 710-711.

Long, B. H., & Henderson, E. H. Self social concepts of disadvantaged school beginners. The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1968, 113, 41-51.

McDaniel, E. L. Relationships between self concept and specific variables in a low-income culturally different population. Pierce-Jones Final Report on Head Start Evaluation and Research: 1966-67. University of Texas, Austin, 1967.

Mead, G. H. Mind, self and society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934.

Miller, H. L., & Woock, R. R. *Social foundations of urban education*. Hinsdale, Ill.: Dryden Press, 1970.

Passow, A. H. (Ed.) *Education in depressed areas*. New York: Bureau of Publications, Columbia University, 1963.

Powers, J. M., et al. A research note on the self-perceptions of youth. *American Educational Research Journal*, 1971, *8*, 665-670.

Purinton, D. E. The effect of item familiarity on self concept sorts. *Dissertation Abstracts*, 1965, *26*, 3225.

Purkey, W. W. *Self concept and school achievement*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1970.

Purkey, W. W., Cage, B. N., & Graves, W. H. The development of a "Pupil Behavior Inventory" to infer learner self concept. Paper presented at Annual Convention of American Educational Research Association, New York, February 1971.

Reeder, T. A. A study of some relationships between level of self concept, academic achievement, and classroom adjustment. *Dissertation Abstracts*, 1955, *15*, 2472.

Rogers, C. R. *Client-centered therapy*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1951.

Rogers, C. R., & Dymond, R. F. (Eds.) *Psychotherapy and personality change*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.

Rosenberg, M. *Society and the adolescent self image*. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1965.

Samuels, S. C. An investigation into some factors related to the self concepts in early childhood of children from middle and lower class homes. *Dissertation Abstracts*, 1969, *70*, 4520.

Sarbin, T. R. A preface to a psychological analysis of the self. *Psychological Review*, 1952, *59*, 11-22.

Sarbin, T. R., & Rosenberg, B. G. Contributions to role-taking theory: IV. Method for obtaining a qualitative estimate of self. *Journal Social Psychology*, 1955, *42*, 71-81.

Shaw, M. C., Edson, K., & Bell, H. The self concept of bright underachieving high school students as revealed by an adjective checklist. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 1960, *39*, 193-196.

Shaw, M. C. Definition and identification of academic underachievers. In L. M. Miller (Ed.), Guidance for the underachiever with superior ability. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1961.

Shulman, L. S. Multiple measurement of self concept. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, February 1968.

Snygg, D., & Combs, A. W. Individual behavior. New York: Harper & Row, 1949.

Soares, A. T., & Soares, L. M. Self-perceptions of culturally disadvantaged children. American Educational Research Journal, 1969, 6, 31-45.

Stanwyck, D. J., & Felker, D. W. Measuring the self concept: A factor analytic study. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council on Measurement in Education, New York, 1971.

Strong, D., & Feder, D. Measurement of the self concept: A critique of the literature. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1961, 8, 170.

Sullivan, H. S. Tensions, interpersonal and international. In H. Cantril (Ed.), Tensions that cause war. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1950.

Tannenbaum, A. J. Social and psychological considerations in the study of the socially disadvantaged. In P. S. Witty (Ed.), The educationally retarded and disadvantaged. Sixty-sixth yearbook, Part I. Chicago, Ill.: National Society for the Study of Education, 1967.

Titchener, E. B. A primer of psychology. New York: Macmillan, 1898.

Trowbridge, N. T. Effects of socioeconomic class on self concept of children: Project impact. Psychology in the Schools, 1970, 7, 304-306.

Waetjen, W. B. Self concept as a learner scale. College Park, Md.: University of Maryland, 1967.

Walsh, A. M. Self concepts of bright boys with learning difficulties. New York: Bureau of Publications, Columbia University, 1956.

Williams, R. L., & Byars, H. Negro self esteem in a traditional society. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1968, 47, 120-125.

Wylie, R. C. *The self concept*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1961.

Yeatts, P. P. *An analysis of developmental changes in the self report of Negro and White children grades 3-12*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1967.

Zirkel, P. A. Self concept and the "disadvantaged" of ethnic group membership and mixture. *Review of Educational Research*, 1971, *41*, 211-225.

Zirkel, P. A., & Moses, E. G. Self concept and ethnic group membership among public school students. *American Educational Research Journal*, 1971, *8*, 253-265.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Ernest H. Owen, Jr. was born July 8, 1942, in Paducah, Kentucky. He attended elementary and secondary school at Lone Oak High School in Lone Oak, Kentucky. He was granted the Associate of Arts degree at Paducah Junior College in Paducah, Kentucky, June, 1962, and the Bachelor of Science degree at Bethel College in McKenzie, Tennessee, June, 1964. The following year he was a teacher at Paducah Junior College and St. Mary High School in Paducah, Kentucky. He worked as a counselor at Heath High School in West Paducah, Kentucky, for one year and at St. Mary High School for two years.

In August, 1967, he obtained the Master of Arts in Education degree at Murray State University in Murray, Kentucky. He was a member of the 1968-69 NDEA Advanced Guidance and Counseling Institute at the University of Florida in Gainesville, Florida, where he earned the Specialist in Education degree in August of 1969. From August, 1969, to June, 1970, he was employed as a teacher at Prairie View Elementary School in Gainesville, Florida. He was a part-time teaching associate in the Department of Educational Foundations at the University of Florida from September, 1970, to August, 1971. He is presently an Assistant Professor in the Department of Psychology at Western Kentucky University in Bowling Green, Kentucky.

He is married to the former Judith Ann Trevathan of Paducah, and they have one daughter, Jill. He is a member of Phi Delta Kappa and the American Educational Research Association.

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Education.

William W Purkey

William W. Purkey, Sr., Chairman
Professor of Foundations of Education

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Education.

Vynce A. Hines

Vynce A. Hines
Professor of Foundations of Education

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Education.

Hannelore Wass

Hannelore L. Wass
Associate Professor of Foundations of Education

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Education.

Franz R. Epting

Franz R. Epting
Assistant Professor of Psychology

This dissertation was submitted to the Dean of the College of Education and to the Graduate Council, and was accepted as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education.

August, 1972

B. L. Sharp by M C Bekker
Dean, College of Education

Dean, Graduate School